



**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
GROUP ART UNIT 2173**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application. No: 09/976,726  
Filed: October 12, 2001  
Inventor(s):  
Jason King, Craig Smith,  
Greg McKaskle and Andrew Dove

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Examiner: Zhou, Ting G.  
Group/Art Unit: 2173  
Atty. Dkt. No: 5150-58700

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD  
FOR ENABLING A  
GRAPHICAL PROGRAM TO  
RESPOND TO USER  
INTERFACE EVENTS

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Mark S. Williams

Mark S. Williams  
Signature

April 6, 2006  
Date

**REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW**

**ATTN: BOX AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated below.

Applicant is in receipt of the Advisory Action mailed March 14, 2006. Claims 1-25, 32-44, 46-60, and 62-89 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks. Please note that for brevity, only the primary arguments directed to the independent claims are presented, and that additional arguments, e.g., directed to the subject matter of the dependent claims, will be presented if and when the case proceeds to Appeal.

Claims 1-7, 10-25, 32-44, 46-60, 62-79, and 82-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cain et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,651,108 (hereinafter "Cain"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Cain relates generally to a relational database management system (RDBMS) in which the user places screen objects (e.g, boxes, screen buttons, table objects, and the like) on an on-screen window or "form". The screen objects have associated properties, as well as methods that execute in response to events.

As per claim 1, Cain does not teach several of the limitations recited therein. In particular, Cain does not teach, "receiving third user input explicitly specifying one or more user interface events to configure for the first node".

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner refers to the section at Col. 10, line 48 – Col. 13, line 17, in which Cain describes an example of building a program which provides a customized button that responds to a mouse click event by displaying a dialog box. The button includes built-in methods that execute in response to events (Col. 3, lines 45-55 and Col. 11, lines 55-59). In particular, the button includes a built-in "pushButton" method that executes in response to push-button events which are generated when the user clicks the button during execution of the program. Cain teaches that the user customizes the pushButton method to make it respond to a push-button event by displaying a dialog box (Col. 12, lines 16-18).

As per the limitation of, "receiving third user input explicitly specifying one or more user interface events to configure for the first node," the Examiner refers to the description of FIGS. 4D-4E. The Examiner asserts that, "users can change or attach new user interface events which the button will respond to via input on the graphical user interface". Applicant respectfully disagrees.

FIG. 4D illustrates a popup menu from which the programmer can select a button property, such as Button Type, Center Label, or Design, or select the Methods menu item (Col. 11, lines 30-44). Selecting the Methods menu item causes the Methods window shown in FIG. 4E to be displayed. The Methods window includes a Built-in Methods listbox which lists the built-in (default) methods already attached to the button (Col. 11, lines 62-67) and a Custom Methods box which lists the names of additional custom (user-defined) methods that have been attached to the button (Col. 12, lines 7-9). Cain teaches that, "The behavior of the button object can be varied in two ways: the built-in methods can be edited or new custom methods can be written" (Col. 12, lines 14-16). Thus, the graphical user interface in FIG. 4E allows the user to change the built-in methods attached to the button or attach new custom methods to the button, but Cain teaches nothing about changing or attaching new user interface events. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has confused a method with an event.

Claim 1 recites, “receiving third user input explicitly specifying one or more user interface events to configure for the first node” and “configuring the first node to receive the one or more user interface events explicitly specified by the third user input during execution of the graphical program”. Cain clearly teaches that the button is configured to receive certain events, such as the push-button event, by default. Cain does not teach configuring the button to receive one or more events that have been explicitly specified by the user, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Cain does not teach, “**associating one or more portions of graphical code with the first node in response to fourth user input, wherein each portion of graphical code comprises one or more nodes for responding to one or more of the user interface events which the first node is configured to receive.**” On the contrary, Cain teaches that the methods which respond to the events comprise text-based code, i.e., program code constructed in a text-based programming language, as opposed to graphical code which comprises one or more nodes. For example, as shown in FIGS. 4F – 4H, the pushButton method which executes to respond to the push-button event is constructed from text-based code, not graphical code.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that Cain does not teach numerous limitations recited in claim 1, and thus, claim 1 is patentably distinct over Cain. Since independent claims 19, 23, 32, 36, 53, 66, and 86 recite similar limitations as those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that these independent claims are also patentably distinct over Cain, for reasons similar to those given above.

As per independent claim 87, the method comprises dynamically registering the first programmatic event during execution of the graphical program. Dynamically registering the first programmatic event causes the first portion of graphical code to execute in response to the first programmatic event being generated.

Cain does not teach dynamically registering the first programmatic event during execution of the graphical program. In the rejection of claim 87, the Examiner refers to the user interacting with the graphical user interface of FIG. 4E. As discussed above, the user interacts with this graphical user interface to change the built-in methods attached to the button or attach new custom methods to the button. The user interacts with the graphical user interface while editing the graphical program, not during execution of the graphical program. Cain teaches nothing at all about an event being dynamically registered during execution of the program.

Furthermore, as discussed above, Cain teaches executing text-based code in response to events being generated, such as the pushButton method shown in FIGS. 4F – 4H. Cain does not teach executing a portion of graphical code in response to an event being generated, where the graphical code comprises

one or more nodes that visually indicate functionality for responding to the event. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 87 is patentably distinct over Cain.

Since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the cited art, for at least this reason. Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested. If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-58700/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Notice of Appeal
- ☒ Amendment After Final Office Action

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark S. Williams  
Reg. No. 50,658  
Agent for Applicant

Date: April 6, 2006 MSW/JLB